May-June 2020 Engagement Summary

September 2020

Questions about this document? Please send an email to engage@cvilleplanstogether.com, or use the comment form on the website.

Contents

Summary of Process and What We Heard 3
Project Background 5
Process Overview 6
Purpose and Planning 6
Summary of Activities 6
How Have We Used and How Will We Use Input? 8
Survey Results 9
Where do Respondents live? 9
Demographics of Survey Respondents 11
How do survey respondents like to receive information? 17
Topic-specific Questions 18
Small-Group Discussions 25
Topic: Equity in Charlottesville 25
Topic: Comprehensive Plan Process and Outcomes 26
Topic: Housing Affordability 30
Comments/Questions from Webinar Q&A 35
Comments/Questions Received Via Email 42
Appendix 1: Detailed Survey Priority Themes 44
Appendix 2: Survey Results By Demographic 49

Summary of Process and What We Heard

Overview & Purpose

Cville Plans Together is an opportunity for the community to actively participate in updating the future vision for the city, with a focus on equity and affordability.

From mid-May through June 2020, the goals of community engagement efforts were to:

- **Share information** about the project process.
- **Make connections** in the Charlottesville community and develop partnerships.
- **Receive initial input** related to the Comprehensive Plan update, including the Affordable Housing Strategy.

This document provides a brief overview of activities and input received.

Community input opportunities included...

A community survey (available in English and Spanish, and in web and paper form).

Webinars to provide a project overview and answer questions.

Small-group discussions held via Zoom/phone.

Toll-free phone line to record input.

Participants included...

1,172 **survey** respondents

About 130 **webinar** attendees at three events

220+ **small-group discussion** participants, in 25 events

Survey Responses By Location



Survey Responses By Neighborhood



Survey & Discussion Topics with High Levels of Interest

- **Housing affordability** throughout the city, at all levels, for renters and homeowners
- **Safe, strong neighborhoods**, for all
- **Racial equity**, including gentrification, displacement, and of historic land use decisions
- **Strengthening existing partnerships and coordination** with the County, UVA, area non-profits, and other organizations
- **Land use** and **urban design** elements, including the potential for increased density, allowing different types of housing, and streamlining the development process
- **Food justice**
- **Community safety** budgeting and equity
- **Walkability/bikeability and transit** improvements (including regional transit)
- **Community engagement**, including transparency and building trust
- **Integration of climate goals** and energy efficiency
- **Park & park connectivity** enhancement
- **Healthcare** accessibility, including mental health supports
- **Wages and job training**
- **Small business support**
- **Connections between topics** and consideration of combined solutions

Quick Facts from the 1172 Survey Responses

83% of people said **addressing housing needs** was a "most critical" priority.

On the topic of housing affordability, **79%** said that **racial equity** was a "most critical" priority, and **73%** said the same about **rental affordability**.

Community health, ***economy & jobs***, *and* ***education*** *were each marked as "most critical" priorities by about 65% of respondents.* ***Housing location*** *(64%),* ***housing supply*** *(63%), and* ***displacement/gentrification*** *(62%) were also top "most critical" priorities.*

In reviewing how ***different demographics groups*** *responded to priority questions, there are many similarities but also some key differences. For example:*

Marked homeownership as a "most critical" issue:

• 76% of Black or African American respondents • 74% of Hispanic or Latinx respondents	vs	• 50% of White or Caucasion respondents • 50% of Asian or Asian American respondents
• 63% of current renters	vs	• 47% of current homeowners

Marked community safety and services as a "most critical" issue:

• 69% of Black or African American respondents	vs	• 36% of White or Caucasian respondents
• 65% of people with household incomes under $29,000/year	vs	• 30% of people with household incomes over $100,000/year

Project Background

Cville Plans Together is an effort to complete two major projects: continuing and finalizing updates to the Comprehensive Plan (the citywide guiding document for land use and development) and an update to the city's zoning ordinance.

The current Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2013, and the city is required to review the document every five years. During previous Comprehensive Plan review processes, in 2017-2018, the Planning Commission and others identified the need to further examine equity, especially related to housing affordability. To this end, the Cville Plans Together effort includes completion of a detailed Affordable Housing Strategy, which will describe goals, priorities, and implementation strategies which will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan update, along with equity-focused updates and others, to be identified in partnership with the community, staff, and City leadership.

To support the City's Comprehensive Plan update, the City of Charlottesville hired a consultant team. More information about the team can be found at cvilleplanstogether.com/about/.

Process Overview

PURPOSE AND PLANNING

The goal of the May-June 2020 community engagement efforts was to share information about the Cville Plans Together process, begin creating a network and connections in the Charlottesville community and develop partnerships in order to bring people into the process, and receive initial input related to the Comprehensive Plan and Affordable Housing Strategy.

Due to COVID-19, the planned community kick-off was not only pushed back from late March to May, 2020, but the city and consultant team were required to adapt the process to utilize safe, socially distanced methods of community engagement. While original plans called for a focus on in-person engagement, including several events and activities in neighborhoods, virtual methods had to be employed instead. To further increase engagement during the ongoing COVID-19 situation, the original survey period was extended to June 27 and the original set of five scheduled open discussions was expanded to ten.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

Outreach

To make community members aware of the process and the input opportunity, the city and consultant team utilized many outreach tools.

- Early key tools included a **project website**, **social media accounts** (Instagram, Facebook, Twitter), **email blasts** (via existing City lists and a new Cville Plans Together list), **press releases**, and **direct emails and phone calls** with community organizations and individuals.
- **Flyers** were distributed in electronic and print form, in English and Spanish. You can download the June overview flyer here: English | Español/Spanish
- **Social media advertisements** (Facebook and Instagram) were used to further build community awareness.
- **A toll-free number** was established for individuals to call for information and to provide input via voice message (Spanish/English).
- To further support **survey distribution**, Cultivate Charlottesville supplemented outreach efforts with paper survey collection at UAC Market Days. An additional partner gathered paper surveys at Friendship Court.
- **Media interviews and engagement**, including a 101.3/In My Humble Opinion radio segment and advertisements, and discussions with 106.1 The Corner/Kendall Stewart, Charlottesville Tomorrow, and NBC29.

CVILLE PLANS TOGETHER
Cville Plans Together is an opportunity for the community to update the city's vision for the future, focusing on the issues of equity and affordability.
Today (6/27) is the last day to take the survey!
surveymonkey.com/r/cville1
What does Charlottesville's future look like to you?
www.cvilleplanstogether.com
engage@cvilleplanstogether.com
(833) 752-6428 (toll free)

Survey

The community survey was open from May 20-June 27, and was available in English and Spanish. 1,172 responses were received. The survey was distributed electronically via email, press release, social media, posting on the City and project websites, and other methods. While some surveys were submitted via paper, most (94%) were submitted online.

How Were Surveys Submitted?



Webinars

Total (non-unique) participants: 130

The consultant team conducted three webinars, with 30-50 participants each. During these events, team members provided an overview of the Cville Plans Together process, shared background information about the planning process in general, and outlined opportunities for getting involved in the process.

- Presentation for all three webinars: Document here (PDF)
- Recordings:
    - Wednesday, May 20 (5:00 PM – 6:00 PM) – View recording here (YouTube)
    - Saturday, May 23 (10:00 AM- 11:00 AM) – View recording here (YouTube)
    - Tuesday, May 26 (12:00 PM – 1:00 PM) – Recording unavailable due to technical issues.

Small-group Discussions

Total (non-unique) participants: 220+

In May and June 2020, a series of discussions was used to facilitate conversations about community goals and priorities, focused on equity and affordability.

There were 10 scheduled discussions, with registration links posted on the website, for which everyone was invited to register and join. There were also approximately 16 additional discussions with individuals or groups of individuals who largely represent underrepresented groups and others whose voices are vital to this process. These discussions included representatives from: JABA, Partners for Mental Health/Region 10, CADRe, IRC LEAD participants, residents at Friendship Court, Sin Barreras, Baha'i Community of Charlottesville, Habitat for Humanity, CRHA and PHAR, several African American homeowners organized with the help of one of the Steering Committee members, and Charlottesville Youth Council members. The consultant team also had discussions with other organizations and agencies including Charlottesville City Schools, the Downtown Job Center, and Home to Hope.

It was possible to join these discussions by calling in or by using the Zoom webinar platform on a phone, computer, tablet, or other device.

For most of these discussions, facilitators led participants through a series of topics:

- Introductions, including neighborhood, and any key questions or concerns.
- A brief overview of the process.
- Equity: When you think about equity and what an equitable Charlottesville could look like, what does that mean for you or your neighbor?
- Comprehensive Plan Outcomes: Thinking about the Comprehensive Plan process, what hopes do you have? What is something positive that you would like to see come out of it?
- Housing: We are looking at a variety of issues related to affordable housing. What are the issues you see as being the most pressing related to housing in Charlottesville.

HOW HAVE WE USED AND HOW WILL WE USE INPUT?

The remainder of this document contains a summary of the input received. The city and consultant team have used, and will continue to use, this input to:

- Identify key themes for revisions to overarching Comprehensive Plan guiding principles and topic-specific visions for the future.
- Assess potential new or revised Comprehensive Plan goals and actions for the future, including for the Affordable Housing Plan.

We will also share input with other relevant staff/agencies/organizations, particularly where input gathered is not directly relevant to the Comprehensive Plan.

Survey Results

All survey questions were optional. Each of the following charts/tables show a breakdown of all 1,172 responses.

WHERE DO RESPONDENTS LIVE?

Most respondents (66%) live in the City of Charlottesville.[1] 62% of those respondents have lived here 10 or more years.





[1] Note: There was some inconsistency in whether respondents considered themselves a Charlottesville resident or not, particularly due to the fact that many Albemarle County residents have Charlottesville addresses. Where neighborhood responses provided more insight into where people lived, we made approximately five adjustments to reflect whether respondents are considered residents of Charlottesville.

There was representation in the survey responses from many neighborhoods in the city. Belmont, North Downtown, Fry's Spring, and Friendship Court counted 50 or more responses each.

Neighborhood (*=self-reported neighborhood name)	**# people**	**% of 771 residents**
Belmont	113	14.5%
North Downtown	66	8.5%
Fry's Spring	64	8.2%
Friendship Court	51	6.6%
Greenbrier	46	5.9%
Fifeville	44	5.7%
Locust Grove	42	5.4%
Martha Jefferson	41	5.3%
Ridge Street	33	4.2%
Woolen Mills	28	3.6%
Venable	26	3.3%
Johnson Village	22	2.8%
Barracks/Rugby	22	2.8%
10th & Page	20	2.6%
Rose Hill	12	1.5%
University	11	1.4%
Lewis Mountain	10	1.3%
Little High	9	1.2%
Rugby Hills	9	1.2%
Jefferson Park Avenue	9	1.2%
Westhaven	8	1.0%
Kellytown	8	1.0%
Greenleaf Park	6	0.8%
Barracks Road	5	0.6%
Forest Hills	4	0.5%
Garrett*	4	0.5%
The Meadows	4	0.5%
Starr Hill	4	0.5%
North East	3	0.4%
Hogwaller*	3	0.4%
Orangedale	3	0.4%
Woodhayven*	2	0.3%
Lochlyn Hill*	2	0.3%
6th Street*	2	0.3%
Cherry Hill*	1	0.1%
Ridge Crest*	1	0.1%
Crescent Hall*	1	0.1%
Michie Drive*	1	0.1%
West Main Street*	1	0.1%
Grove Avenue	1	0.1%
Downtown Mall*	1	0.1%
Carlton*	1	0.1%
8th Street*	1	0.1%
(Blank)	26	3.3%
All Charlottesville City survey respondents	*771*	*100%*

Map of Survey Respondents by Neighborhood



DEMOGRAPHICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

This section shows responses by different demographic areas. The first five charts are followed by a table that compares how survey respondent demographics (City resident respondents alone, as well as all respondents together) compare to 2018 US Census American Community Survey results. Where demographics for the survey responses were very out of proportion with overall city demographics, strategies for future engagement will include targeted outreach to reach demographics not well-represented in this survey.



	2018 ACS 5-year Est.		May-June 2020 Survey			
Total	47,042	% City pop.	771 residents	% resident respondents	1,172	% all respondents
RACE / ETHNICITY						
White or Caucasian Alone	30,923	65.7%	540	70.0%	742	63.3%
Black or African American Alone	8,773	18.7%	87	11.3%	127	10.8%
Two or more selected	1,263	2.7%	15	1.9%	25	2.1%
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin (all) [2]	2,531	5.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Hispanic or Latinx Alone	n/a	n/a	15	1.9%	23	2.0%
Asian or Asian American Alone	3,356	7.1%	23	3.0%	24	2.0%
Other (for the planning survey, these had < 3 responses each)	44	0.1%	14	1.8%	17	1.5%
No response	n/a	n/a	59	7.7%	214	18.3%

[2] The Cville Plans Together survey results related to identification as Hispanic/Latinx are presented in a line separate from the ACS results because the responses do not yield a direct comparison. The ACS asks separate questions about identifying as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin and then race identification. The Cville Plans Together survey asked one combined question about race/ethnicity, as in the previous Comprehensive Plan survey from 2018, asking respondents to choose all relevant answers.



	2018 ACS 5-year Est.		May-June 2020 Survey			
Total	18,613	% City households	771 residents	% resident respondents	1,172	% all respondents
ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME [3]						
Under $15,000	3,042	16%	56	7.3%	66	5.6%
$15,000 - $29,999 (planning survey)	n/a	n/a	66	8.6%	83	7.1%
$15,000 - $34,999 (ACS)	2,911	15.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
$30,000 - $49,999 (planning survey)	n/a	n/a	101	13.1%	132	11.3%
$35,000 - $49,999 (ACS)	2,348	12.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
$50,000 - $74,999	2,740	14.7%	120	15.6%	157	13.4%
$75,000 - $99,999	2,082	15.0%	95	12.3%	135	11.5%
$100,000 - $150,000	2,797	5.8%	143	18.5%	204	17.4%
Over $150,000	2,693	14.5%	118	15.3%	174	14.8%
(Blank)	n/a	n/a	72	9.3%	221	18.9%

[3] ACS results for this question are compiled by household, and the Cville Plans Together survey likely received some responses from the same households. In addition, the Cville Plans Together survey inadvertently used income ranges that were inconsistent with ACS data in the range of $15,000-$49,000; these results are shown in separate lines for clarity.



	2018 ACS 5-year Est.		May-June 2020 Survey			
Total	47,042	% City pop.	771 residents	% resident respondents	1,172	% all respondents
SEX/GENDER IDENTITY						
Female	24,212	51.5%	482	62.5%	660	56.3%
Male	22,830	48.5%	217	28.1%	304	25.9%
Self-described	n/a	n/a	4	0.5%	4	0.3%
No response	n/a	n/a	19	2.5%	204	17.4%



	2018 ACS 5-year Est.		May-June 2020 Survey			
Total	47,042	% City pop.	771 residents	% resident respondents	1,172	% all respondents
AGE						
<18	7,385	15.7%	9	1.2%	18	1.5%
18-24	9,532	20.3%	51	6.6%	66	5.6%
25-34	9,500	20.2%	179	23.2%	216	18.4%
35-44	5,772	12.3%	173	22.4%	235	20.1%
45-54	4,973	10.6%	114	14.8%	158	13.5%
55-64	4,841	10.3%	100	13.0%	143	12.2%
65-74	3,050	6.5%	96	12.5%	150	12.8%
75-84	1,331	2.8%	23	3.0%	34	2.9%
85 or older	658	1.4%	3	0.4%	6	0.5%
No response	n/a	n/a	23	3.0%	146	12.5%

In terms of your residence, are you a...



	2018 ACS 5-year Est.		May-June 2020 Survey			
Total	47,042	% City pop.	771 residents	% resident respondents	1,172	% all respondents
RESIDENCE: OWN/RENT [4]						
Homeowner occupied	8,045	43.2%	463	60.1%	654	55.8%
Rental occupied	10,568	56.8%	274	35.5%	340	29.0%
Other	n/a	n/a	20	2.6%	40	3.4%
(Blank)	n/a	n/a	14	1.8%	138	11.8%

Type of Residence by Location of Residence



[4] ACS results for this question are compiled by household, and the Cville Plans Together survey likely received several responses from the same households.

Aside from your primary residence, do you own or rent any property in the city?



Race/Ethnicity and Renter/Owner





HOW DO SURVEY RESPONDENTS LIKE TO RECEIVE INFORMATION?

Survey respondents were asked how they prefer to receive information about city planning practices. Several strategies utilized in May and June fell into the top responses (email, social media, website). In addition, some respondents noted the importance of using mailings, radio, and other methods to reach out to those who don't have access to or comfort with using the internet to obtain information.

How do you prefer to get information about city planning processes? (Select all that apply.)		
Email alerts or newsletters – including City lists, Neighborhood Association lists	712	61%
Social media (Facebook, NextDoor, Twitter)	347	30%
Visiting a website	220	19%
Online news sites	216	18%
Word of mouth from your friends/others	195	17%
Mailings (flyers, newsletters)	145	12%
Print newspaper	109	9%
Radio	98	8%
Text alerts	97	8%
Other (please specify): TV news; Churches; Cville Slack; affinity organizations		

TOPIC-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of addressing specific topics. There were two questions, each with a separate list of topics:

- Question 1: Please tell us how important you believe it is to address the items below in order to achieve a fair, equitable, and positive future for all Charlottesville residents.
- Question 2: Please tell us how important you believe it is to address the items below in order to adequately respond to Charlottesville's housing needs.

Responses to each of these are summarized in the section that follows. Further details about specific demographic responses can be found in the Appendix.

Question 1: Please tell us how important you believe it is to address the items below in order to achieve a fair, equitable, and positive future for all Charlottesville residents.



Results by topic-specific outcomes

For each of the topic areas shown in the previous charts, survey respondents were asked not only to rate each topic in terms of the need to address it, but also what outcomes they would like to see related to each topic.

The consultant team used a coding system to tag these open-ended responses for analysis. Each response was tagged with one or more "themes" characterizing the content of the comments provided; the number of responses within each theme are shown in the charts that follow.

Further details showing themes with up to 10 responses can be found in the Appendix.

HOUSING THEMES	# RESPONSES
Importance of affordability (general improvements/comments)	139
Up-zone/allow for more units in zoning/more density	49
Focus on extremely to very low-income people (approx. <50% AMI)	31
Gentrification/displacement – need protection	22
Address various levels / all price points	21

COMMUNITY HEALTH THEME	# RESPONSES
Food justice/equity (general improvements/comments)	66
Healthcare access & affordability (e.g., free clinic, telehealth)	54
Healthcare (general improvements/comments)	39
Non-city issue (Federal issue, state issue, universal health care)	37
Equity in treatment/outcomes	26
Food justice – grocery location, transport to groceries, affordability	25
Food justice – address food deserts	21
Healthcare for all	20

ECONOMY & JOBS THEMES	# RESPONSES
Living wage	79
Training/workforce development	77
Small business support	56
Raise minimum wage/raise wages	40
COVID-19 considerations (general improvements/comments)	31
Minority business support	27
Broaden economic base	23

EDUCATION THEMES	# RESPONSES
Improved outcomes/achievement gap	38
Adult education & training	29
Importance of education in general	28
Pre-k (free, universal)/early childhood	25
Equal access to opportunities and programs	25

School funding too low/funding changes needed	24
Vocational training (e.g., CATEC)	24
More pay for teachers/more teachers	22
Equity (general improvements/comments)	22

ENVIRONMENT THEMES	# RESPONSES
Increase renewable/sustainable energy – reduce carbon emissions	98
Environmental sustainability (general improvements/comments)	91
Require or incentivize green developments/buildings	67
Include sustainability in all planning processes/programs	51
Reduce vehicle usage – foster a more walkable/bikeable city	33
Environmental justice	29
Stormwater/green infrastructure	28

TRANSPORTATION THEMES	# RESPONSES
More/better sidewalks & connections	82
More/better bicycle facilities & connections	77
Greater transit frequency and reliability	68
More transit routes and stops	61
Transit (general improvements/comments)	52
Separated/protected bike lanes; trails/paths	42
Bike infrastructure (general improvements/comments)	40
Site-specific issues	36
Free or subsidized transit	33
Pedestrian infrastructure (general improvements/comments)	32
Less parking / no new parking	30
Multimodal transportation (general improvements/comments)	23
Reduce car use	22
Transit connections to county / outlying areas	21

COMMUNITY DESIGN THEMES	# RESPONSES
Increase density	64
Affordable housing/housing affordability	61
Mixed income/demographics – diversify neighborhoods	46
Better mix of uses/more mixed-use	37
Human scale/appropriate scale	26
Preserve Charlottesville's character/sense of place	26
More multifamily housing	25
Site-specific issue	25

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT THEMES	# RESPONSES
Transparency/openness (general improvements/comments)	35
Ensure everyone has access – need diverse/representative participation	30
Lots of opportunities for engagement now; recent improvements	23

COMMMUNITY SAFETY AND SERVICES THEMES	# RESPONSES
Less emphasis on policing; reduce police funding; reallocate police budget to community services	134
Build trust/community relationship – community policing	68
Reform police; training	33
Police accountability/transparency – CRB, evaluation	25

PARKS AND RECREATION THEMES	# RESPONSES
More urban agriculture/gardens/parks	69
Better connections between parks (ex: trails, routes)	56
Plans for open space preservation	43
We have good parks/enough parks	41
Accessibility (general improvements/comments)	32
Maintain existing parks and recreation spaces	31
Equity (general improvements/comments)	22
More activities for kids and adults	22
Facilities in underserved areas	21

Note: The "other" category did not have any coding themes with more than 20 responses.

OTHER THEMES ("what's missing?")	# RESPONSES
City governance/leadership/coordination	14
Taxes/spending/funding	14
Recognize interconnectedness of different issues/all items are critical	12

Question 2: Please tell us how important you believe it is to address the items below in order to adequately respond to Charlottesville's housing needs.



Results by topic-specific outcomes

As with Question 1, for each of the topic areas shown in the previous charts, survey respondents were asked what outcomes they would like to see. The consultant team used a coding system to tag these open-ended responses for analysis. Each response was tagged with one or more "themes" characterizing the content of the comments provided; the number of responses within each theme are shown in the charts that follow. Themes with 10 or more responses are shown in the following tables.

RACIAL EQUITY THEMES	# RESPONSES
Anti-racism, addressing systemic racism (including racial covenants, reparations, etc.)	50

Support for racial equity (general improvements/comments)	26
Enforce laws related to discrimination/racial equity	21
Desegregation / diversify neighborhoods	10

AFFORDABILLITY THEMES	# RESPONSES
Affordability (general improvements/comments)	61
Rent control/rent increase control/rent reduction	23
Use partnerships/relationships to address affordability	17
Supply - need more housing in general	13
Affordability level – focus on extremely to very low-income people (<50% AMI approx.)	12
Up-zone/allow for more units in zoning/more density	11
Different types of housing options	10
Leave to the markets/city cannot address affordable housing	10

HOUSING LOCATION THEMES	# RESPONSES
Affordable housing throughout the city / mixed income neighborhoods	54
Housing near affordable transportation/transit	53
Affordability (general improvements/comments)	15
General importance of housing location/accessibility	14
Site-specific comments/issues	13
Housing near services and schools	12
Partner with County, UVA, Habitat, etc. to build more housing	11
Housing near healthy food options/gardens/groceries	10

HOUSING SUPPLY THEMES	# RESPONSES
Up-zone/allow for more units in zoning/more density	42
Different types of housing options	37
Affordability (general improvements/comments)	23
Supply - Need more housing in general	20
Use partnerships to increase support (e.g., UVA, County)	10

DISPLACEMENT & GENTRIFICATION THEMES	# RESPONSES
Gentrification/displacement – support protective measures (related to taxes, development potential, increased property value)	41
Taxes – role in displacement	24
Affordability – more housing that is affordable will help with displacement	11

HOUSING QUALITY THEMES	# RESPONSES
Housing quality (general importance)	26
Landlord responsibility/absentee landlords	24
Enforce rules/standards, inspections	18
Public housing quality/maintenance/design	18
Use partnerships to improve housing - e.g., local non-profits	10

HOUSING STABILITY THEMES	# RESPONSES
Address housing stability/evictions - general need for improvements in governance, staffing	29
Renter protection - e.g., right to counsel, renter protection/tenants' rights	29
COVID-19 considerations (general improvements/comments)	21
Renter financial assistance	20
Protections for owner/not the city's role to get involved with eviction protection	13
Eviction ban	11
Need to enforce existing requirements/protections	10

SUPPORTIVE-TRANSITIONAL HOUSING THEMES	# RESPONSES
Reduce number of unhoused people	46
Supportive/transitional housing	40
Affordability (general importance)	11
Use partnerships to address this need (e.g., local non-profits and housing providers)	11
Site-specific issues	10

HOMEOWNERSHIP THEMES	# RESPONSES
Make homeownership more affordable; provide financial support to reduce barriers	50
Homeownership is not important for all / not a major priority	29
Support minority home ownership / no discrimination (racial, language)	25
Partnerships (Habitat, United Way, PHA, other non-profit developers) – funding and support for existing programs	23
Homeownership (general support)	20
Education/financial counseling	15
Foster homeownership at all levels	15
Homeownership as an important wealth-building tool	13
Want more people owning homes; fewer large property owners	11

OTHER ("WHAT'S MISSING?")	# RESPONSES
Recognize interconnectedness of different issues / all items are critical	16

Small-Group Discussions

As previously noted, there were 26 discussions total:

- **Scheduled Small-group Discussions**: 10 scheduled discussions, widely advertised and posted on the website for open registration.
- **Additional Small-group Discussions**: 16 additional discussions with individuals or groups of individuals. These were organized by the consultant team and others, to help ensure representation in the process by underrepresented groups and others whose voices are vital to this process. For a list of groups, please see page eight in this document.

The list below shows key points from the small-group discussions, breaking input up into the three main topics of discussion: **equity** in Charlottesville, the **Comprehensive Plan outcomes and process**, and **housing affordability**. Direct quotes, where included, were recorded from discussion participants.

TOPIC: EQUITY IN CHARLOTTESVILLE

Equity is…

- Access to resources, information, opportunity, including information regarding the services that city and nonprofits offer.
- Not necessarily giving everybody the same thing, but giving the same opportunities by injecting specific supports and removing specific barriers.
    - Making sure that everybody has the resources to succeed from a very young age.
- Access to cleaner or more efficient types of energy.
- Everyone being able to live in desirable places with amenities and opportunities.
- Both the number of people who can benefit and the timeline in which people can benefit.
- Financial equity, housing equity, building a business.
- Hard work – it is difficult but important to tackle issues of equity.
    - "Equity is an ideal and it's hard to realize."
- Addressing systematic oppression.
- Mobility, equitable transportation access, and options.
- Hard to define for a community. What does an equitable community look like? Would be good to see examples.

Focus on inclusive solutions

- Think broadly about who is impacted, by race, gender, age, income/wealth.
- Embrace diversity in housing and in the population as a positive characteristic.
- Ensure representative participation in the process.
- Take down barriers and provide supports at various levels so that people can participate.
- Ensure that kids/students are supported - access to food, etc.
- Support for immigrants.

  - Latinx communities hit worse by COVID. They were often the first laid off, and barred from the stimulus check, unemployment.
  - Difficult for immigrants to participate and give ideas about ways the city can improve.
    - "It feels like immigrants live here but don't exist here."

Address existing tensions in the city

- Everyone needs to play a role.
  - Think about role of large employers, institutions. How can they give back to their employees - home ownership grants, etc.
  - Positive impacts of UVA are recognized, but UVA needs to play a big part in solutions.
- Charlottesville is often seen as having two communities. Need to unite the city.
  - "In this city, there's the rich and the poor and there's not a big middle class."
- People need to want equity for everyone. If they did, we wouldn't need to talk about it.
  - "People won't always respond to the 'greater good.'"
  - "Even liberal people will fight changes that impact them."
- Address implicit bias in the community.
  - The Black community is always described as "low-income."
  - "The city forgets about the Black working class."
- Recognize history tied to race in Charlottesville and how it got us where we are today
  - Zoning, Neighborhood Associations, HOAs.
  - "Tale of two cities" - Wealthy (often white) families coming in, living in wealthy neighborhoods, and Black families who have been here for a long time.
- Everybody wants to be in certain places and Charlottesville is one of them.
  - People retire and they want to come to a place like Charlottesville.
  - "We are experiencing the growing pains of being an economic hub."
- Displacement/gentrification: Address the loss of Black neighborhoods.
  - Want people to be able to remain in or return to Charlottesville.
  - Want sustainable communities of color.
  - "Large landlords buy up lots and build large houses in the middle of Black neighborhoods and drive prices up."

TOPIC: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PROCESS AND OUTCOMES

Comprehensive Plan in general

- Should be easy to read it, use it, and understand what we are saying and trying to do.
- Should have a translated summary, at minimum.
- Radical solutions needed.
- Comprehensive plan as a commitment and not just aspirational.
  - Plan must be specific in terms of goals, strategies, and measuring success.
  - Include an action plan, with shorter-term actions, not just longer-term. Signage installation, quick changes in commercial zoning, etc.
  - Good to have discrete goals and ways to measure, but need to build in accountability.
  - Demonstrate political will. There has been a historical lack of commitment.

    - Include a plan for updates and implementation moving forward. If we can develop plans in predictable cycles and communicate what these cycles are, it helps to build trust.
    - Action is important. Historic area issues can cause delays.
- Should include discussion of funding.
    - "What kind of budget does the City have for progressing the plan and where is that money coming from? Can money be pulled from other places for implementation?"
- Provide an equity tool or assessment.
- Want adaptable plan that will allow us to adjust policies as we learn/implement.
- Charlottesville is not as big as it seems; spills over into County quickly. More collaboration with the County is needed.

Ideas about the overall vision for the city's future

- Focus on both meeting the economic tax base needs and the question of equity.
- Create more "Community hubs" → encourage localism and local economy.
- Incentivize a mixed-income, integrated community.
- Create ladders - job ladders, housing ladders.
- Need a shared vision for the city that includes affordable housing, but considers profitability of development, so people will want to invest.
- Address potential generational differences in attitudes toward growth and change.
- Work toward a stronger community identity.

Zoning/development

- General zoning input
    - Zoning must reflect the comprehensive plan vision so that we can eliminate using the special use process, which has very low density limits.
    - Consider form-based zoning.
    - Zoning needs to be addressed in such a way where people can understand the impacts. Not just density in terms of numbers but also form and building placement.
    - Rezoning, for many, has dangerous connotations, either because of history or because they are wary of change.
- Density/neighborhoods/mix of uses
    - Neighborhood scale is important.
    - Housing needs to be in the context of a thriving, livable neighborhood.
    - Allow small grocery stores in neighborhoods.
    - Allow for a variety of housing situations (e.g., multigenerational living, family-sized housing, accessory dwelling units) and mixed types of housing (e.g., Woolen Mills).
    - With more dense, compact land use in areas outside of downtown – other nodes that can be affordable, walkable, etc.
    - Use mixed use (housing/commercial) to meet needs/gaps in communities.
    - Mixed use and pedestrian friendly environment - that's why people are obsessed with living downtown. It's about the quality of life.
    - Encourage properties with offices to have apartments above them.
- Work on predictability and building trust with the development community.

    - Need to make processes clearer and more streamlined.
    - Difficult to try and bring something that balances the city's messaging of needing more density, but not wanting to give too much height.
    - Need to have a clear set of rules.
    - Would like more predictability and receptivity in the development process. Right now, there is a reactionary tone to all new development, rather than coming together to collaborate and create.
- Redevelop areas that are not going to be used for their old purposes (e.g., older malls) to repurpose for new and needed uses.
- Vacancies are an issue. There are lots of vacant buildings that have space.
- Want to see more about Opportunity Zones and the City's plan for strategic investment in areas where there has been historic underinvestment.
- City should focus on the land it has and what it can build on it.
- Reconsider parking requirements.

Engagement ideas, for this process and others

- Don't just ask for opinions - use them. Make people a part of the outcomes, process.
- Pay attention to the diversity of who is in the room.
- Civic education is important, so people understand the process. Ensure that the people most impacted by changes are not only at the table but fully understand the ramifications of potential changes.
- Make sure the process is accessible and welcoming.
    - Go to people, don't have them always come to you.
    - Address access to technology and ability to participate.
    - Get as many voices as possible to speak about what's happening. E.g., should have ways for people with disabilities to speak up, not just through a survey.
    - Make spaces to talk about the abundance of NIMBYism in a way that is protective of people being targeted in such conversations.
    - Make sure meetings/processes are accessible to families, esp. working families.
- Make sure all voices are heard.
    - Listen to those who are most impacted, who may also be the most distrustful of the process.
    - Not all low-income residents are in public housing, but groups like PHAR often have the most representation.
    - Need true citizen representation.
    - "Squeaky wheels always get the grease."
- Let neighborhoods decide on actions. Don't assume what neighborhoods want - talk with them.
- Need better outreach and notifications.
    - Tap into food distribution networks with City schools.
    - Work with schools, churches, students (recent County examples) for outreach.
    - Not all Neighborhood Associations are very active and people need to know about opportunities to give feedback before it's too late.
- City needs to tell residents how the process will work: Comp. Plan update, then zoning.

Transportation infrastructure

- Lots of development is completely car dependent. Make city more walkable.
- Link transit to housing.
- Transport chapter doesn't currently have a specific mode share goal - we have one for reducing single-occupancy vehicles but no goal for what the other mode shares should be.
- Cyclists tend to be a bit more organized - groups, bike shops, routes. People who walk are less organized but need to be engaged.
- Public transport options.
    - Transit as a utility.
    - Bus doesn't go everywhere people need to go. E.g., we don't have warehouses here, so people need to go elsewhere for jobs.
    - Jaunt does ADA services, but city residents are not eligible for services unless they have a disability.
    - "It's never been 'cool' to ride the bus here." Always has had a stigma.

Economic development

- Align economic development and workforce development more closely.
- There are some fields of work we don't have space for in this community.
    - "From an economic standpoint, we have no middle class."
    - No manufacturing, no skilled trades. School system focuses on four-year degrees.
- Support small business.
    - More support for Black-owned businesses.
    - 3% City support given to minority owned businesses. Disparity there?
    - Local business owners feel more ownership in a community.
    - Small retail, grocery, etc.
- Job opportunities and more economic development opportunities that help people move up the economic ladder.
    - Work to tackle job access barriers - transportation, access to childcare.
    - Jobs with higher wages, improved benefits.
- City is zoned a technology zone. Impact can trickle down to individuals via grocery stores, restaurants, etc.

Energy/environment/food justice

- Energy efficient housing.
- Making the city more environmentally friendly; planning for new clean energy.
- More green spaces and community gardens.
- Food justice. Access to healthy foods, places to grow food.

Other specific topics participants would like to see addressed

- More city/county cooperation.
- Resilience planning.
- Make downtown more accessible to everyone.

- Acknowledge the role of seniors in the community.
- Generational wealth issues.

TOPIC: HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Definition

- Be clear and explicit about what the tradeoffs may be to get more affordable housing.
- Clarify definition of "affordable." May need to reframe what "affordable" means. We need to understand what target/AMI we are trying to hit.
    - "Guidelines based on AMI are not very affordable." Make sure guidelines are truly reflective of the incomes in the area.
- Everybody deserves housing.
- "We are going to have the uncomfortable conversation in this process about where housing is going and not everyone is going to be happy."
- There's a continuum that needs to be built into the housing system, homelessness -> renting -> homeownership (for example).

Coordination with/impact of UVA

- Want UVA to be involved, and be a part of the solution. UVA must be engaged in this effort and accountable in addressing the housing situation.
    - "40% of low-income residents in Charlottesville are UVA students."
- UVA students may be more responsive to issues of equity than in the past.
- UVA should build more on-campus housing and more housing where students already live.
- Some feel pushed out due to UVA development in the city.
    - "UVA is trying to move all the way down the street."
    - Main Street is "Charlottesville Central" – concerns about Prospect, Cherry Avenue.

Coordination with County

- Housing issues can't be solved without the County.
- People move in and out of the city based on what is available at an affordable price.
- A lot of people being displaced from Charlottesville are going to certain parts of the county, and "now the city's problem is becoming a county problem."

City role

- Dillon's Rule issues hinder a lot of what can be done at the local level.
- Need to look holistically at the housing spectrum in terms of funding support. "Right now, organizations need to battle for funding each year."
- City should be a developer. Increase the housing fund and get in the business of building affordable housing.
- Must work together with developers.

- Should celebrate new units of affordable housing.
- "Voting 'no' is becoming symbolism. Can we turn it around so that a 'yes' vote is a symbol of equality?"

Incentives/disincentives

- Everyone needs to contribute to affordable housing.
- Increase or providing more incentives to build affordable housing. Adjust incentives for developers so they don't just build more, but they also build more affordable housing.
- Tax incentives to rent below market value and providing housing for those who need it most.
  - "I would rent my house as part of a program where the city pays part of the rent for a tenant."
- Programs that will help landlords do upgrades to apartments in exchange for keeping rents lower.
- Incentivize energy efficiency and decrease energy burden.
- Payment to incentivize owners to not sell land.
- Rethink limits on affordability. When building subsidized properties, should need to house families for 10-20 years.
- People own apartments and live out of town. Is there a way to disincentivize that?
  - Vacancy taxes.
- Encourage growth in the tax base income - more funds for affordable housing.
- Look for ways to make sure some of the real estate tax goes into affordable housing.

Housing quality

- Housing safety and quality is important. There is a lot of housing that is not in good shape.
  - There should be a sense of personal responsibility for those who own rentable property.
  - Most of our Section 8 housing needs to be upgraded.
  - "Property owners won't fix properties in certain areas."
- Consider safety of housing and how that is linked to equity and access (can people walk safely, are buildings designed safely).

Zoning/development

- Need changes in zoning to produce more housing.
  - City has a desire to grow affordable units, but no capacity.
  - "We need more housing at a reasonable price, and the only way to begin that conversation is to change the zoning so it's possible."
  - "The City has to be willing to turn their principles on their head. They've said they don't want spot zoning, but that's the only way to address the preservation of certain types of housing in certain types of areas."
  - But consider unintended consequences.
- Address short-term rental housing and impacts.
- Density can't be discussed without look at making it understood and desirable.
  - "We can have more density and still live in neighborhood that reflects who we are."

- Need to see how the planning process can translate into units.
- Find a balance with people who are reluctant to see changes in their neighborhoods.
- Embrace different housing types, throughout the city.
    - Live/work type rentals.
    - Want to see smaller units and infill, both for rental and ownership.
    - Integrate affordable housing so it's a part of the overall fabric of the city.
    - Avoid pockets of low-income housing throughout the city.
    - Small home or tiny home village for unhoused people.
    - Missing middle housing needs to be addressed.
    - Look at accessory dwelling units.
    - Housing for larger families, multigenerational families (4-bed, etc.).
- Preserve existing housing. "It's more expensive to tear down and build new."
- Cars and parking are an issue.
    - Need to re-think blanket parking standards and think about a mode shift and expansion of transportation options.
    - If we eliminate parking then we also need to think about building schools and grocery stores near everyone, so people don't have to drive.
- Consider senior living and needs specific to seniors.
    - "With senior living, developers don't want to touch Charlottesville because Charlottesville doesn't want it."
- Account for the full ladder of housing.
- As new developments come along, make sure that a good percentage are affordable.
    - "Developers should not be able to buy their way out of building affordable housing by committing funds to the affordable housing fund."

Housing location

- Affordable units integrated into established neighborhoods.
- Proximity of housing to amenities/services/other places.
- Create amenities around existing housing. Bringing in childcare, businesses, etc., to that community, so residents and others can utilize those resources.
- Look at infrastructure and how that connects and divides people.
- People need to understand how affordable housing impacts access to education.

Protections/assistance

- Gentrification - protect long-time residents in communities.
    - Assist those who are experiencing tax increases.
- Help people stay where they are, if they want to be there.
- Voucher/subsidy that allows people to live where they want to live.
    - Difficult to find landlords willing to accept vouchers, etc., in areas that people want to live – e.g., close to public transport, feels safe.
- Immigrant communities
    - It's difficult for immigrants to be eligible for many housing opportunities that other people living in Charlottesville have.

    - Language barriers allow people to take advantage of immigrant communities (e.g., withholding of information or people not knowing tenant's rights).
- Assist recently incarcerated individuals
    - Cost of housing coupled with discrimination is a barrier - racial, felony convictions.
    - Updated list of landlords who are willing to accept people with criminal backgrounds.
    - Rental applications can be an issue. Background checks.

Affordability/accessibility

- People who work here should be able to live here. People aren't paid enough to live in the place where they work.
- Dire shortage of housing at all levels. Most pronounced at deeply affordable levels - trickle-down effect.
- Need support in housing transition – as people make more money, their other costs go up.
    - "I feel trapped" - no steps to get to the next level and out of public housing.
- Can't rely on market alone for housing affordability.
    - Can the city do something similar to rent control (which is not allowed by the state)?
    - Sliding scale rent, with mixed income within a building.
    - Even if we build more houses, will still be expensive, because demand is high.
- Wages impact affordability; how do we provide better wages and address the wage gap?
    - "Even a small amount of very wealthy people can drive up prices".
- Impact of energy costs. Energy burden – older apartment complexes, trailers have higher burden. Housing that has a low energy bill is more affordable.
- Is density the only want to generate affordability or can we promote equity within the housing stock that there is?
- Charlottesville would be a great community to age in - services, health care, entertainment, education - but not much affordable housing.
    - Many seniors have fixed incomes that make it difficult to pay increasing rents.
- Housing available in other counties, but leads to transportation issues.
    - City wants to spend more money for people to work, but shouldn't have to live elsewhere to live and then commute.
    - Is the public transit system really serving the people it's intended to serve? Many people work in the service industry and can't afford to live near work, so they need a car which is an added expense.

Homeownership

- Need education around home ownership - lots of programs out there. Need more advertising.
- Related to generational wealth.
    - Policy or support for increasing homeownership in low wealth communities.
    - Want to see homeownership that represents the population and not just how wealth has historically been distributed.
- Make home ownership more attainable – helps people build financial equity
    - Option to purchase accessory dwelling units or rent/lease-to-own apartments.
    - If in subsidized housing - subsidize down payment instead of monthly rental payment.
    - Federal government allows housing voucher to be put towards a housing purchase.

    - Funding for home repairs.
- Community land trust.
- Work with employers to support affordable homeownership.
    - Opportunities for matched savings/down payment savings.

Supportive/transitional housing and services

- "When stable and affordable housing is not available, we pay for it in other ways" → need to make an upfront investment.
- People who need services are the least likely to engage in any process.
    - Include people living on social security disability income (right under $800/month).
- Consider resource centers in neighborhoods where transportation is not as readily available.
- Support for formerly incarcerated people and people with substance abuse issues.
- Homelessness is an issue. Need to build transitional housing.
- When you're talking about the needs of individuals with disabilities, one size does not fit all.
- Need better supports so families can stay together.

Comments/Questions from Webinar Q&A

WEBINAR 1 (MAY 20, 2020)

- *Question:* Will the audio on these meetings be posted somewhere?
  - *Response:* Recordings will be posted on YouTube and CvillePlansTogether.com.
- Would it be possible to display how many attendees are present and who are they?
  - Unfortunately, the Zoom webinar platform does not allow that option. There are about 30 people on the webinar currently.
- Will the Planning Commission collaborate with the consultant team on writing the Plan?
  - Yes. The consultant team will be coordinating with staff and the Planning Commission to update the plan, working from draft 2018 updates.
- How will the City be working with UVA? For example, if UVA provided more residential housing it could help increase the existing local housing stock and aid in affordability.
  - We do recognize the need to work with UVA. The University President has put forth goals for housing affordability and they have a working group that will likely get started once they're able to do so, given the COVID situation. We will continue to coordinate with the University as we move forward.
- How many Steering Committee members are associated or employed by UVA? Is UVA over-represented?
  - There is one Steering Committee member representing UVA – the University Architect.
- On slide 14, median income and rent both rose in the chart since 2010. The monthly increase in the gap between income versus rent widening by approximately $45 or <5%. Am I misinterpreting the chart on the slide?
  - No. The median income and rent are both rising but the median renter household cannot afford the median gross rent.
- For the draft of the current Comprehensive Plan, have there been updates since 2018?
  - We are working from the 2018 draft chapter updates; no further edits have been completed.
- Where can we get a copy of the current comp. plan and draft 2018 chapters?
  - We have posted the current plan (adopted in 2013) and the available 2018 draft chapters on the project website – go to "documents & materials" and then "related plans."
- How will you be including the recently-established climate goals?
  - The city has planned a climate action planning process for this summer and we will be coordinating with them around that effort. We are also aware of the existing goals and we will be working to ensure that those are incorporated.
- Do you have an update on the status of re-zoning and potentially moving the City Yard.

    - We don't have information about that, but we can connect you to others who may.
- Can the Comprehensive Plan include a recommendation for some sort of periodic survey to understand how demographics (e.g., race, income) are associated with indicators in the city?
    - Yes, that is something we can consider as part of, for example, the Community Engagement chapter. As part of our effort, we are looking to gather as much demographic information as we can, not only to target our outreach and better understand who we are hearing from but also so that we can understand how different people are affected in different ways.
- Are you looking at cross-sectoral topics? The climate conversation is usually held within the topic of "environment" but there are a lot of climate justice and climate equity issues that are related to affordability and equity in general.
    - We will be looking for ways to show how different strategies or actions are impacting (or being impacted by) other areas. We want to make the connections between different areas clear.
- What efforts will be made to provide translation services for meetings?
    - For our meetings, we are working towards integrating translation services and tackling challenges with the virtual setup. We will work to make resources available for everyone, through interpretation of events or translated materials.
- Can surveys all include demographic information, since our segregation issues prevail? I imagine the responses may vary widely from group to group.
    - Yes. Though it is optional, we have requested demographic responses on the survey. We hope everyone will opt in to providing that information.
- There is a Community Engagement chapter in the plan. Is there a way to include constant evaluation and measuring of progress in the document so the City can measure how well it's doing in reaching the goals the plan lays out?
    - Yes, the implementation chapter will include ways to evaluate progress for all goals.
- Can you remind us where the survey is on the website?
    - The survey is posted on the "Stay Involved" page.
- What are two or three strategies for increasing the amount of affordable housing that you've seen work successfully in other cities?
    - We don't have our housing experts with us right now on the call, and I am hesitant to state specific strategies because we haven't gotten to the point of identifying recommendations for Charlottesville. We know that there have been recent moves in zoning – for example, lots of places have looked at zoning for single-family residential, and whether that should be adjusted in some places to allow more density. Outside of increasing the amount of affordable housing on the ground, we're also going to be looking at access to opportunity. In addition, there are

many different types of organizations working now in the housing realm; the plan could also look at connecting those groups to new resources.

- Is there/will there be an evaluation of the previous comp. plan in terms of its effectiveness? Regardless of whether one supported its goals or not, for people new to the idea of a comp. plan it might be informative to know just how much the comp. plan created the desired "on the ground" results.
    - We talked a lot with the Planning Commission about the 2013 plan, and the fact that the zoning was not updated to reflect the 2013 plan. So, in some ways, it's not clear how effective the current plan is. There is an opportunity to work with the Planning Commission and others and see how we can gauge results.

WEBINAR 2 (MAY 23, 2020)

- How many people have attended these two Zoom presentations, and how many are not already formally involved as representatives of community segments?
    - The webinars to-date, including today, have had 55-60 people participate. Percentage wise, a guess would be that 60-70% of the people who have participated in these first two webinars have not been formally involved as representatives previously.
- What are the biases and limitations of the Comp Plan's current chapter topics and organization? It appears to be an ad hoc collection of topics timely to the community, or those with a voice here, at one point in time. For instance, I am surprised that one key aspect of sustainability is NOT in the chapter headings—SOCIAL sustainability. How do other communities name and organize their Comp. Plan chapters?
    - It varies by community. For example, DC's recent comp. plan looked at some different naming conventions, with cross-cutting topics. There are some requirements for what needs to be in the document, so if those items are addressed, there aren't requirements for how those chapters are named. There is likely an opportunity to think about how they could be reorganized.
- What is impact of Airbnb rentals on the quantity of affordable housing units? How can the Comp Plan prioritize housing for local residents, not weekend or game day housing for outsiders, e.g., university alumni/parents?
    - We don't have our housing experts on the call with us today, but they are considering the issue of Airbnb and similar rentals, and have heard about that issue from others. We know it's of interest to people in a lot of cities when talking about affordable housing. We know there are issues with vacancies, especially now, during COVID. We can try to provide a more concrete answer on that as we move forward.
- Does this process include Neighborhood Associations? They are an excellent source of community feeling.

    - Yes, we want them to be involved. We have reached out via email to the Neighborhood Association leaders and hope to engage more with them as this process moves forward.
- Prior Comp. Plans reduced residents to stakeholders who identified their selfish desires and priorities with post it notes. There was no attempt to build coalitions, create bridges, and increase understanding of shared community goals. How can this process improve community participation and community building?
    - The small-group conversations that we've had have been interesting in terms of bringing different groups to the table. They have been quite diverse. We know there are people who have not traditionally participated in public processes. We want to have an approach focused more on community building and helping people speak with each other to build an understanding and consideration for the interests of others and the issues that impact them. We hope everyone who participates will help us extend an invitation to others.
- Meetings such as this are inherently going to exclude members of the community without access to online services. When able, will there be public meetings, and will they be held in multiple places in order to effectively reach out to community members who might have difficulty traveling? Southwood is chronically ignored for a lot of these reasons.
    - We originally planned to have meetings out in the neighborhoods, meeting people where they are, and we do plan to do that when we can do so safely. We want to meet people where they are and talk in a comfortable setting, for better, more effective relationship-building.
- Is the toll-free number available in languages other than English for residents who do not speak English as their primary language?
    - That is something we are working on and it will be available soon. [Note: It was made available in Spanish.]
- Who determines who is on the Steering Committee? I see no business people on the list.
    - The NDS Director and City Manager created the Steering Committee list. At the first meeting with the Steering Committee, the group requested more community resident representative, and we added several community members. There is representation from the Downtown Business Association, though we recognize that group does not represent all business owners in the city. If there is a group that needs to be engaged more directly in this process, we're happy to organize a small group discussion or other ways to involve groups, and we can consider additions to the Steering Committee if needed.
- Have you been reaching out via NextDoor?
    - No. The city does not have a NextDoor account, and it is difficult to get access to NextDoor when you do not live in the community, since it is tied to your mailing

address. However, we do encourage community members to share information via their own NextDoor accounts.

- According to your early survey data, how many or what percentage of African American males have you heard from?
    - We have 90 survey responses right now, and have not dug into demographic details at this time, but we'll be happy to share that information from the final survey.
- What role will the work behind the four small area plans and the draft SIA form-based code play in this process?
    - All existing plans and recent initiatives will be reviewed for ways that they can be incorporated into the update. We don't want to reinvent the wheel, particularly where they have already been community processes. We also want to learn from those processes in terms of engagement.
- Regarding the implementation strategies, will those include performance measures that indicate whether we've achieved our equity goals and sustainability goals?
    - Yes. We want this to be a plan that the community is invested in and part of that is being able to decide how we know when a goal is achieved.
- There are many people who work in the community, but do not live here. How do you plan on engaging with those folks?
    - We welcome anyone who has a relationship to Charlottesville for any reason to respond to the survey. It's important to consider people who work in the city but don't live here, especially I they are interested to live here but cannot afford to, for example. We recognize there are many connections between the city and county, for example with transportation, with housing.
- What does involving the UVA community in this process look like to you? Is this more student- or faculty- and staff-based engagement?
    - Both, ideally. The UVA community is a huge component of housing, and a huge employer. Important to look at how people who work there are impacted – housing, transportation, other day-to-day. Student housing issue is not one that students themselves influence as much as some other factors but looking at the priorities of people who live in Charlottesville is important in general. We have the University Architect as a representative on the Steering Committee. The UVA president has also set some goals around housing and creating units, so they have been establishing working groups, which have been stalled due to COVID, but our intention will be to coordinate with UVA on that.
- Is there a hope to track gender information on folks who use things like transportation, parks, etc., to make sure that the plans/operation for these things is equitable to different genders (or is this already happening?)

- We are tracking that information for surveys we do and in our interactions (when we can), but as far as actual use of facilities, that's not something we're doing as part of this effort. Can't speak to how others in the city may be tracking use data, but something like that could be a part of measuring the outcomes of our plan.

WEBINAR 3 (MAY 26, 2020)

Note: the recording of Webinar 3 was not able to be saved due to a technical issue. Questions provided via the chat box are shown below; questions asked verbally during the meeting are included, where possible, but all questions may not be reflected in the list.

- How will you track your outreach efforts? Is there a target % of the population that you would like to see engaged? How is success defined?
  - We will be summarizing engagement efforts at each step along the way. We do not have a specific target percentage of the population we want to reach; our focus is on working toward representative participation.
- You mentioned your review of "revised chapters". How does the public access these revised chapters from the last Comp. Plan?
  - We have posted the 2013 plan and the available 2018 draft chapters on the project website – go to "documents & materials" and then "related plans"
- At some point when we are looking at the land use map, it would be helpful if you could orient us to the map.
  - As we move forward in this process, we will focus on ensuring that all parties have their bearings when looking at maps of land use or other elements of discussion.
- Do you want input from Albemarle residents? Or maybe I should ask in what way can Albemarle residents contribute?
  - We welcome anyone who has a relationship to Charlottesville for any reason to respond to the survey, and to participate in discussions.
- Who is the bubble represented by City Reps.?
  - "City Reps." on the graphic related to community involvement refers to anyone who is an official representative of the city – City Council, Boards & Commission, staff, etc.
- Can you talk about how you hope to engage historically marginalized City residents in this process?
  - This is an area of focus for us. We hope to build trust and bridges of communication by connecting through community leaders and existing organizations. When it is safe and feasible to do so, we will be holding meetings out in neighborhoods, especially those with high percentages of historically marginalized communities.
- Another group to consider is those who visit Charlottesville for health care, shopping, etc.

    - We agree – from the local economy, to transportation, housing, and other features, both City residents and other visitors are stakeholders.
- For the project Steering Committee, how are the community residents able to join that committee?
    - We encourage anyone who is interested to sit in on the meetings (virtually, for now, and in person, when possible). At this point, we are not seeking additional participation in the Steering Committee, but we do consider, as needed, the need to adjust the Steering Committee to ensure representation.
- As part of the business community, is the Charlottesville Regional Chamber involved? If not, why?
    - We have reached out to the Chamber to distribute information about engagement events to their members. We do have a member of CADRe on the Steering Committee; CADRe is a roundtable that is part of the Chamber.
- I don't see the website online. Is it launched from Charlottesville.org?
    - The website can be accessed from a link on the City's website or directly at www.CvillePlansTogether.com.

Comments/Questions Received Via Email

In May-June 2020, there were approximately 30 emails received, including emails directly sent to members of the project team, sent to the project email address (engage@cvilleplanstogether.com), or submitted via the project website. Topics of these emails are summarized below.

- Connections to local organizations, local media; requests for media interviews.
- Requests for additional small-group discussion options.
- Website
    - Request to provide a list of names and representative organizations on the Steering Committee on the website.
    - Add a "Take the Survey" button to the web site home page, and add a share button at the end of the survey.
    - Request for more information about the project, consultant team, and who is reading survey responses.
    - Request that all previously completed plans be posted on the website.
- Consultant team
    - Requests for contact information for the consultant team.
    - Request for more frequent/significant feedback loop between consultant team and community related to what information is being gathered.
- Survey-related input
    - Suggestions related to survey format for future surveys.
    - Concerns about the current survey format.
    - Suggestion to distribute surveys at events.
- Other ideas/Concerns
    - Comments related to the need to consider all issues together as critical issues.
    - More representation from communities related to mental health and developmental disabilities.
    - Suggestion that community stakeholders connected to each of the four small area plans (the SIA, Hydraulic, Cherry Avenue/Fifeville, and Starr Hill) be convened for discussions.
    - Letter from Preservation Piedmont with suggestion for protection of historically Black neighborhoods, caution related to assumptions about density and affordability, and consideration for preserving and rehabilitating existing housing stock as more affordable than new housing stock.
    - Consider a major sidewalk initiative.
    - Coordinate with Habitat and Neighborhood Associations.
    - Be explicit that affordable housing needs apply to many, including teachers, police, firemen, municipal workers, and UVA employees.

- Consider properties in the County for affordable housing initiatives.
- Importance of face to face conversations to learn other points of view.
- Suggestion to consider participatory budgeting in the process.
- Concern related to potential impacts of zoning changes in historic African American neighborhoods.
- Concerns related to the Steering Committee discussions related to housing.
- Consider mixed-use zoning.
- Consider reducing or eliminating parking requirements, with consideration for people with disabilities.
- Consider limiting the footprint of an accessory building to no more than 30% of a rear yard.
- Would like the permitting process to be easier – hard to find information.
- Would like clear mode-share goals in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Suggestion to review https://cvillebridgebuilders.org/

Appendix 1: Detailed Survey Priority Themes

Question 1: Please tell us how important you believe it is to address the items below in order to achieve a fair, equitable, and positive future for all Charlottesville residents.

Survey respondents what outcomes they would like to see related to each topic. The consultant team used a coding system to tag these open-ended responses for analysis. Each response was tagged with one or more "themes" characterizing the content of the comments provided; the number of responses within each theme are shown in the charts that follow. Themes with 10 or more responses are shown below, with those having 50+ responses shown in **bold**.

HOUSING THEMES	# RESPONSES
Importance of affordability (general improvements/comments)	**139**
Up-zone/allow for more units in zoning/more density	49
Focus on extremely to very low-income people (approx. <50% AMI)	31
Gentrification/displacement – need protection	22
Address various levels / all price points	21
Homeownership (general improvements/comments)	19
Different types of housing options	18
People who work here should be able to live here	17
Mixed income/demographics	16
Reduce number of unhoused people	16
Site-specific issues	15
Supply – need more housing in general	14
Address low-moderate income (80-120% AMI) affordability level	13
Housing quality (general improvements/comments)	13
Anti-racism, addressing systemic racism (racial covenants, reparations, etc.)	12
Require affordable units in development projects/don't allow optional payment	12
Make home ownership more affordable – financial support to reduce barriers	12
Support homeownership for all financial levels	11
Public housing rehabilitation/redevelopment	11
Affordable housing throughout the city / mixed income neighborhoods	10
Support for accessory dwelling units (ADUs)	10

COMMUNITY HEALTH THEME	# RESPONSES
Food justice/equity (general improvements/comments)	**66**
Healthcare access & affordability (e.g., free clinic, telehealth)	**54**
Healthcare (general improvements/comments)	39
Non-city issue (Federal issue, state issue, universal health care)	37
Equity in treatment/outcomes	26
Food justice – grocery location, transport to groceries, affordability	25
Food justice – address food deserts	21

Healthcare for all	20
Mental health support	19
Community gardens – more gardens, support existing orgs.	18
Partnerships (UVA/TJPDC/Region 10/etc.)	14
Insurance issues	14
Markets (affordable, locations, mobile markets)	12
COVID-19 considerations (general improvements/comments)	12
Access to information about health	10
Housing quality/affordability	10

ECONOMY & JOBS THEMES	# RESPONSES
Living wage	**79**
Training/workforce development	**77**
Small business support	**56**
Raise minimum wage/raise wages	40
COVID-19 considerations (general improvements/comments)	31
Minority business support	27
Broaden economic base	23
More jobs (general improvements/comments)	17
Economic opportunity for all	13
Site-specific issues	13
Private sector partnerships	12
Local business improvements	11
General business support/economic vitality	11
Equity (general improvements/comments)	10

EDUCATION THEMES	# RESPONSES
Improved outcomes/achievement gap	38
Adult education & training	29
Importance of education in general	28
Pre-k (free, universal)/early childhood	25
Equal access to opportunities and programs	25
School funding too low/funding changes needed	24
Vocational training (e.g., CATEC)	24
More pay for teachers/more teachers	22
Equity (general improvements/comments)	22
Curriculum – classes to keep, bring back, add	17
Reduce racism in schools; improve curriculum especially related to Black history	17
Balanced funding for schools; address school zoning inequity issues, desegregate	16
COVID-19 considerations (general improvements/comments)	16
Funding for after-school care, summer programs, and student support services	12
Quality/funding (general comments/concerns)	11
School facilities/services (general improvements/comments)	11
Support for minority students and families	11
School quality is good/spending is adequate	10
Remove police/SROs in schools	10

Adult education (general improvements/comments)	10

ENVIRONMENT THEMES	# RESPONSES
Increase renewable/sustainable energy – reduce carbon emissions	**98**
Environmental sustainability (general improvements/comments)	**91**
Require or incentivize green developments/buildings	**67**
Include sustainability in all planning processes/programs	**51**
Reduce vehicle usage – foster a more walkable/bikeable city	33
Environmental justice	29
Stormwater/green infrastructure	28
Recycling/waste (general improvements/comments)	19
Eco-friendly city and businesses (general improvements/comments)	18
Climate goals	17
Protect waterways/water quality	17
More/preserve trees	17
Regional coordination (with UVA, with County)	16
Equity (general improvements/comments)	15
Improve drinking water quality	14
Climate change / energy usage (general improvements/comments)	13
More/preserve green space	12

TRANSPORTATION THEMES	# RESPONSES
More/better sidewalks & connections	**82**
More/better bicycle facilities & connections	**77**
Greater transit frequency and reliability	**68**
More transit routes and stops	**61**
Transit (general improvements/comments)	**52**
Separated/protected bike lanes; trails/paths	42
Bike infrastructure (general improvements/comments)	40
Site-specific issues	36
Free or subsidized transit	33
Pedestrian infrastructure (general improvements/comments)	32
Less parking / no new parking	30
Multimodal transportation (general improvements/comments)	23
Reduce car use	22
Transit connections to county / outlying areas	21
Equity (general improvements/comments)	18
More/safer crossings	17
Already have good transportation/maintain as is	16
More and/or cheaper parking	16
Reduce traffic /improve traffic patterns	15
Increase transit use	15
Transportation – other	13
New transit modes (e.g., streetcar, light rail, etc.)	12
Accessibility of sidewalks and crosswalks (e.g., clear of obstructions)	10
Transit near low income neighborhoods, etc.	10

COMMUNITY DESIGN THEMES	# RESPONSES
Increase density	**64**
Affordable housing/housing affordability	**61**
Mixed income/demographics – diversify neighborhoods	46
Better mix of uses/more mixed-use	37
Human scale/appropriate scale	26
Preserve Charlottesville's character/sense of place	26
More multifamily housing	25
Site-specific issue	25
Need housing strategy / more housing (generally)	18
Protect neighborhood character	18
Protect historic resources/districts	18
More open space/protect open space/better access	16
Reduce/eliminate/modify single-family zoning (R-1, R-2 zoning)	15
Deregulation / less restrictive regulations	15
Equitable/non-discriminatory zoning	14
Walkable and bikeable community	14
Zoning/regulatory improvements (general)	12
Inclusion/engagement of historically underrepresented communities	11
Anti-racism, addressing systemic racism (including racial covenants, reparations, etc.)	10
Remove Confederate/racist statues	10

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT THEMES	# RESPONSES
Transparency/openness (general improvements/comments)	35
Ensure everyone has access – need diverse/representative participation	30
Lots of opportunities for engagement now; recent improvements	23
Advertising of opportunities / more advance notice with agendas	19
Want a process that is more collaborative, civil, respectful	17
Access to information about decision-making and budgeting processes	17
Outreach/communication (general improvements/comments)	17
City workgroups and committee improvements	15
Types of participation/methods (general improvements/comments)	14
Engagement needs improvements (general improvements/comments)	12
Continue virtual engagement	12
Meet people where they are/go into neighborhoods and go to community events	12
Community leadership and participation in decision making	12
More civic education (schools, adults)	12
Transparency related to the police budget/CRB	10
City Council/Leadership (general improvements/comments)	10
Responsiveness to community input	10

COMMMUNITY SAFETY AND SERVICES THEMES	# RESPONSES
Reduce police funding; reallocate police budget to community services	**134**
Build trust/community relationship – community policing	**68**
Reform police; training	33

Police accountability/transparency – CRB, evaluation	25
City is currently safe / safety not a priority area right now	17
Fire dept. – more funding/higher wages	15
Utility accessibility and cost – reduce cost/provide access for all	14
Less racial profiling – more balanced policing; serve equally for fire/rescue	12
Restructure police/demilitarize the police	11
Police – more funding/higher wages	10

PARKS AND RECREATION THEMES	# RESPONSES
More urban agriculture/gardens/parks	**69**
Better connections between parks (ex: trails, routes)	**56**
Plans for open space preservation	43
We have good parks/enough parks	41
Accessibility (general improvements/comments)	32
Maintain existing parks and recreation spaces	31
Equity (general improvements/comments)	22
More activities for kids and adults	22
Facilities in underserved areas	21
COVID-19 considerations (general improvements/comments)	19
Open space/parks (general improvements/comments)	13
More/preservation of trees	12
Accessible by public transportation	12
More funding for parks/rec.	11
Accessible facilities (disabilities, elderly)	11
Near housing	11
Recreation (general improvements/comments)	10

OTHER ("what's missing?")	# RESPONSES
City governance/leadership/coordination	14
Taxes/spending/funding	14
Recognize interconnectedness of different issues/all items are critical	12

Note about Question 2

Because there were fewer themes generated for Question 2 categories, a set of extended themes was not warranted for the second question.

Appendix 2: Survey Results By Demographic

Question 1: Please tell us how important you believe it is to address the items below in order to achieve a fair, equitable, and positive future for all Charlottesville residents.

In the table that follows, we show responses for Question 1 summarized by race/ethnicity and then by household income level. In doing this, we can sense trends specific to certain demographics, which can help to begin to identify existing inequities.

Responses by Race/Ethnicity

	Most Critical	Less Important	Not a Current Major Concern	No Response	Total #
HOUSING	83.1%	11.3%	3.5%	2.0%	1172
Asian or Asian American	75.0%	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	89.8%	3.9%	3.1%	3.1%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23
White or Caucasian	87.1%	9.8%	2.2%	0.9%	742
Two or more selected	76.0%	24.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	66.7%	20.3%	7.4%	5.6%	231
COMMUNITY HEALTH	65.4%	24.2%	7.4%	2.9%	1172
Asian or Asian American	62.5%	25.0%	8.3%	4.2%	24
Black or African American	82.7%	9.4%	4.7%	3.1%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	73.9%	17.4%	4.3%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	65.1%	27.0%	6.6%	1.3%	742
Two or more selected	60.0%	32.0%	8.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	57.1%	23.4%	11.7%	7.8%	231
ECONOMY & JOBS	65.0%	26.6%	4.9%	3.4%	1172
Asian or Asian American	54.2%	25.0%	8.3%	12.5%	24
Black or African American	85.0%	9.4%	2.4%	3.1%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	82.6%	13.0%	0.0%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	61.7%	30.6%	5.8%	1.9%	742
Two or more selected	64.0%	24.0%	4.0%	8.0%	25
Other or not specified	64.1%	25.1%	3.9%	6.9%	231
EDUCATION	65.0%	24.7%	7.0%	3.2%	1172
Asian or Asian American	91.7%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	82.7%	11.0%	3.9%	2.4%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	87.0%	8.7%	0.0%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	62.1%	28.7%	7.0%	2.2%	742
Two or more selected	52.0%	36.0%	12.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	61.0%	22.5%	8.7%	7.8%	231
ENVIRONMENT	56.4%	32.1%	8.5%	3.0%	1172
Asian or Asian American	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	55.9%	29.1%	10.2%	4.7%	127

	Most Critical	Less Important	Not a Current Major Concern	No Response	Total #
Hispanic or Latinx	56.5%	26.1%	17.4%	0.0%	23
White or Caucasian	58.2%	33.4%	6.9%	1.5%	742
Two or more selected	52.0%	40.0%	4.0%	4.0%	25
Other or not specified	51.9%	29.0%	11.7%	7.4%	231
TRANSPORTATION	51.3%	36.3%	10.1%	2.3%	1172
Asian or Asian American	54.2%	8.3%	37.5%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	60.6%	23.6%	11.8%	3.9%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	52.2%	34.8%	8.7%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	51.8%	40.3%	7.3%	0.7%	742
Two or more selected	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	45.5%	33.3%	14.3%	6.9%	231
COMMUNITY DESIGN	51.2%	35.2%	10.7%	3.0%	1172
Asian or Asian American	45.8%	37.5%	16.7%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	64.6%	20.5%	11.0%	3.9%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	60.9%	26.1%	8.7%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	48.4%	39.4%	10.6%	1.6%	742
Two or more selected	56.0%	32.0%	8.0%	4.0%	25
Other or not specified	51.9%	30.7%	10.4%	6.9%	231
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & INVOLVEMENT	44.0%	40.3%	12.5%	3.2%	1172
Asian or Asian American	33.3%	41.7%	25.0%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	64.6%	24.4%	7.1%	3.9%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	52.2%	26.1%	8.7%	13.0%	23
White or Caucasian	41.5%	43.8%	12.5%	2.2%	742
Two or more selected	40.0%	48.0%	12.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	41.6%	38.1%	14.3%	6.1%	231
COMMUNITY SAFETY & SERVICES	41.0%	38.2%	17.7%	3.1%	1172
Asian or Asian American	62.5%	20.8%	16.7%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	69.3%	18.1%	9.4%	3.1%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	47.8%	39.1%	13.0%	0.0%	23
White or Caucasian	36.4%	42.2%	19.3%	2.2%	742
Two or more selected	28.0%	48.0%	24.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	39.0%	37.2%	16.9%	6.9%	231
PARKS, OPEN SPACES, & RECREATION	29.6%	48.0%	20.0%	2.4%	1172
Asian or Asian American	33.3%	50.0%	8.3%	8.3%	24
Black or African American	46.5%	29.1%	20.5%	3.9%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	26.1%	56.5%	13.0%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	23.9%	53.9%	20.6%	1.6%	742
Two or more selected	24.0%	40.0%	36.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	39.4%	39.4%	17.7%	3.5%	231

Responses by Household Income

Household Income	Most Critical	Less Important	Not a Current Major Concern	No Response	Total #
HOUSING	83.1%	11.3%	3.5%	2.0%	1148
Under $15,000	93.9%	4.5%	1.5%	0.0%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	84.3%	7.2%	4.8%	3.6%	80
$30,000 - $49,999	84.8%	9.1%	3.0%	3.0%	128
$50,000 - $74,999	87.3%	8.9%	2.5%	1.3%	155
$75,000 - $99,999	87.4%	8.9%	2.2%	1.5%	133
$100,000 - $150,000	84.3%	12.3%	2.5%	1.0%	202
Over $150,000	81.6%	13.2%	4.6%	0.6%	173
(Blank)	72.9%	17.2%	5.4%	4.5%	211
COMMUNITY HEALTH	65.4%	24.2%	7.4%	2.9%	1138
Under $15,000	69.7%	24.2%	4.5%	1.5%	65
$15,000 - $29,999	69.9%	19.3%	6.0%	4.8%	79
$30,000 - $49,999	79.5%	13.6%	6.1%	0.8%	131
$50,000 - $74,999	64.3%	25.5%	7.0%	3.2%	152
$75,000 - $99,999	66.7%	25.9%	5.9%	1.5%	133
$100,000 - $150,000	60.3%	31.9%	6.4%	1.5%	201
Over $150,000	58.0%	28.2%	13.2%	0.6%	173
(Blank)	64.7%	20.4%	7.2%	7.7%	204
ECONOMY & JOBS	65.0%	26.6%	4.9%	3.4%	1132
Under $15,000	77.3%	15.2%	4.5%	3.0%	64
$15,000 - $29,999	65.1%	22.9%	6.0%	6.0%	78
$30,000 - $49,999	67.4%	24.2%	4.5%	3.8%	127
$50,000 - $74,999	65.0%	27.4%	4.5%	3.2%	152
$75,000 - $99,999	60.0%	32.6%	4.4%	3.0%	131
$100,000 - $150,000	65.7%	28.4%	4.4%	1.5%	201
Over $150,000	57.5%	33.9%	7.5%	1.1%	172
(Blank)	68.3%	21.3%	4.1%	6.3%	207
EDUCATION	65.0%	24.7%	7.0%	3.2%	1134
Under $15,000	71.2%	18.2%	9.1%	1.5%	65
$15,000 - $29,999	69.9%	21.7%	4.8%	3.6%	80
$30,000 - $49,999	67.4%	22.0%	6.8%	3.8%	127
$50,000 - $74,999	66.2%	27.4%	3.8%	2.5%	153
$75,000 - $99,999	66.7%	23.0%	8.1%	2.2%	132
$100,000 - $150,000	65.2%	26.0%	6.9%	2.0%	200
Over $150,000	59.8%	31.0%	8.6%	0.6%	173
(Blank)	62.0%	22.6%	7.7%	7.7%	204
ENVIRONMENT	56.4%	32.1%	8.5%	3.0%	1137
Under $15,000	54.5%	31.8%	9.1%	4.5%	63
$15,000 - $29,999	48.2%	41.0%	6.0%	4.8%	79
$30,000 - $49,999	59.1%	31.1%	7.6%	2.3%	129
$50,000 - $74,999	57.3%	29.9%	11.5%	1.3%	155
$75,000 - $99,999	56.3%	35.6%	6.7%	1.5%	133
$100,000 - $150,000	63.7%	30.9%	2.9%	2.5%	199
Over $150,000	47.1%	39.7%	12.1%	1.1%	172

(Blank)	58.4%	24.0%	11.3%	6.3%	207
TRANSPORTATION	51.3%	36.3%	10.1%	2.3%	1145
Under $15,000	59.1%	24.2%	10.6%	6.1%	62
$15,000 - $29,999	43.4%	36.1%	16.9%	3.6%	80
$30,000 - $49,999	52.3%	37.9%	7.6%	2.3%	129
$50,000 - $74,999	45.2%	42.0%	12.1%	0.6%	156
$75,000 - $99,999	51.9%	37.8%	8.9%	1.5%	133
$100,000 - $150,000	54.9%	37.7%	6.4%	1.0%	202
Over $150,000	50.6%	39.1%	9.2%	1.1%	172
(Blank)	52.5%	30.8%	12.2%	4.5%	211
COMMUNITY DESIGN	51.2%	35.2%	10.7%	3.0%	1137
Under $15,000	53.0%	30.3%	12.1%	4.5%	63
$15,000 - $29,999	49.4%	33.7%	10.8%	6.0%	78
$30,000 - $49,999	46.2%	40.9%	9.1%	3.8%	127
$50,000 - $74,999	51.0%	36.3%	11.5%	1.3%	155
$75,000 - $99,999	57.8%	31.9%	9.6%	0.7%	134
$100,000 - $150,000	52.9%	34.3%	11.8%	1.0%	202
Over $150,000	46.0%	40.8%	12.1%	1.1%	172
(Blank)	52.9%	31.2%	9.0%	6.8%	206
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INVOLVEMENT IN CITY PROCESSES	44.0%	40.3%	12.5%	3.2%	1134
Under $15,000	63.6%	30.3%	6.1%	0.0%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	45.8%	38.6%	10.8%	4.8%	79
$30,000 - $49,999	52.3%	34.8%	8.3%	4.5%	126
$50,000 - $74,999	46.5%	37.6%	13.4%	2.5%	153
$75,000 - $99,999	45.2%	40.0%	14.1%	0.7%	134
$100,000 - $150,000	38.2%	48.5%	11.3%	2.0%	200
Over $150,000	32.8%	45.4%	19.5%	2.3%	170
(Blank)	44.3%	37.6%	11.3%	6.8%	206
COMMUNITY SAFETY AND SERVICES	41.0%	38.2%	17.7%	3.1%	1136
Under $15,000	63.6%	22.7%	12.1%	1.5%	65
$15,000 - $29,999	66.3%	13.3%	15.7%	4.8%	79
$30,000 - $49,999	48.5%	32.6%	15.2%	3.8%	127
$50,000 - $74,999	41.4%	35.7%	21.0%	1.9%	154
$75,000 - $99,999	30.4%	48.9%	18.5%	2.2%	132
$100,000 - $150,000	35.8%	44.6%	19.1%	0.5%	203
Over $150,000	23.6%	50.6%	23.6%	2.3%	170
(Blank)	45.2%	35.3%	12.7%	6.8%	206
PARKS, OPEN SPACES, AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	29.6%	48.0%	20.0%	2.4%	1144
Under $15,000	42.4%	36.4%	18.2%	3.0%	64
$15,000 - $29,999	34.9%	41.0%	16.9%	7.2%	77
$30,000 - $49,999	32.6%	42.4%	22.0%	3.0%	128
$50,000 - $74,999	25.5%	47.8%	26.1%	0.6%	156
$75,000 - $99,999	18.5%	58.5%	21.5%	1.5%	133
$100,000 - $150,000	23.0%	55.4%	20.1%	1.5%	201
Over $150,000	23.0%	57.5%	18.4%	1.1%	172
(Blank)	43.0%	37.1%	16.3%	3.6%	213

Question 2: Please tell us how important you believe it is to address the items below in order to adequately respond to Charlottesville's housing needs.

In the table that follows, we show data for Question 2 summarized by race/ethnicity. In doing this, we can sense trends specific to certain demographics, which can help to begin to identify existing inequities.

Responses by Race/Ethnicity

Topic Area	Most Critical	Less Important	Not a Current Major Concern	No Response	Total #
RACIAL EQUITY	**79.5%**	**8.2%**	**5.2%**	**7.1%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	62.5%	4.2%	33.3%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	90.6%	2.4%	5.5%	1.6%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	91.3%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	86.8%	9.2%	2.7%	1.3%	742
Two or more selected	88.0%	4.0%	8.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	49.8%	9.5%	10.4%	30.3%	231
RENTAL AFFORDABILITY	**73.5%**	**15.3%**	**3.6%**	**7.7%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	75.0%	16.7%	8.3%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	87.4%	6.3%	3.9%	2.4%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	87.0%	0.0%	4.3%	8.7%	23
White or Caucasian	79.0%	17.4%	2.0%	1.6%	742
Two or more selected	72.0%	24.0%	4.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	46.8%	13.9%	7.8%	31.6%	231
HOUSING LOCATION	**64.0%**	**23.6%**	**4.7%**	**7.7%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	54.2%	12.5%	33.3%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	79.5%	15.0%	2.4%	3.1%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	82.6%	0.0%	8.7%	8.7%	23
White or Caucasian	69.9%	26.0%	2.7%	1.3%	742
Two or more selected	48.0%	32.0%	12.0%	8.0%	25
Other or not specified	37.2%	23.4%	8.2%	31.2%	231
HOUSING SUPPLY	**62.8%**	**23.5%**	**5.2%**	**8.4%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	45.8%	37.5%	12.5%	4.2%	24
Black or African American	76.4%	11.8%	7.1%	4.7%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	69.6%	17.4%	4.3%	8.7%	23
White or Caucasian	68.1%	27.0%	2.7%	2.3%	742
Two or more selected	56.0%	28.0%	12.0%	4.0%	25
Other or not specified	40.3%	17.7%	10.8%	31.2%	231
DISPLACEMENT OR GENTRIFICATION	**62.0%**	**22.2%**	**7.8%**	**8.0%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	45.8%	25.0%	20.8%	8.3%	24
Black or African American	80.3%	9.4%	6.3%	3.9%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	78.3%	8.7%	4.3%	8.7%	23
White or Caucasian	67.4%	26.0%	5.0%	1.6%	742
Two or more selected	64.0%	24.0%	12.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	34.6%	17.7%	16.0%	31.6%	231

Topic Area	Most Critical	Less Important	Not a Current Major Concern	No Response	Total #
HOUSING QUALITY	**58.1%**	**28.2%**	**5.6%**	**8.1%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	66.7%	29.2%	4.2%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	72.4%	22.0%	2.4%	3.1%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	87.0%	4.3%	4.3%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	62.0%	31.1%	4.9%	2.0%	742
Two or more selected	52.0%	36.0%	12.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	34.6%	23.4%	9.5%	32.5%	231
HOUSING STABILITY	**57.7%**	**25.6%**	**8.3%**	**8.4%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	54.2%	20.8%	25.0%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	78.0%	12.6%	6.3%	3.1%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	78.3%	8.7%	4.3%	8.7%	23
White or Caucasian	61.9%	29.9%	5.9%	2.3%	742
Two or more selected	44.0%	32.0%	24.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	32.9%	20.3%	13.9%	32.9%	231
SUPPORTIVE AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING	**55.5%**	**30.2%**	**6.1%**	**8.2%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	54.2%	16.7%	29.2%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	76.4%	14.2%	5.5%	3.9%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	65.2%	21.7%	4.3%	8.7%	23
White or Caucasian	58.5%	34.9%	4.3%	2.3%	742
Two or more selected	48.0%	44.0%	8.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	34.6%	24.7%	9.5%	31.2%	231
HOMEOWNERSHIP	**49.0%**	**32.7%**	**10.1%**	**8.3%**	1172
Asian or Asian American	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	24
Black or African American	75.6%	12.6%	8.7%	3.1%	127
Hispanic or Latinx	73.9%	17.4%	4.3%	4.3%	23
White or Caucasian	49.7%	38.7%	9.2%	2.4%	742
Two or more selected	52.0%	40.0%	8.0%	0.0%	25
Other or not specified	29.0%	26.0%	13.0%	32.0%	231

Responses by Household Income

	Most Critical	Less Important	Not a Current Major Concern	No Response	Total #
RACIAL EQUITY	79.5%	8.2%	5.2%	7.1%	1172
Under $15,000	90.9%	6.1%	3.0%	0.0%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	81.9%	6.0%	9.6%	2.4%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	88.6%	4.5%	4.5%	2.3%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	84.1%	10.8%	3.2%	1.9%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	82.2%	8.9%	6.7%	2.2%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	84.8%	9.3%	4.9%	1.0%	204
Over $150,000	82.8%	12.1%	4.6%	0.6%	174
(Blank)	57.5%	5.4%	5.9%	31.2%	221
RENTAL AFFORDABILITY	73.5%	15.3%	3.6%	7.7%	1172
Under $15,000	86.4%	12.1%	1.5%	0.0%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	85.5%	7.2%	2.4%	4.8%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	87.9%	9.1%	1.5%	1.5%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	80.9%	12.1%	3.8%	3.2%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	79.3%	14.8%	4.4%	1.5%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	74.5%	20.6%	3.4%	1.5%	204
Over $150,000	66.7%	27.0%	4.0%	2.3%	174
(Blank)	52.0%	11.3%	5.0%	31.7%	221
HOUSING LOCATION	64.0%	23.6%	4.7%	7.7%	1172
Under $15,000	77.3%	13.6%	6.1%	3.0%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	67.5%	18.1%	8.4%	6.0%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	72.7%	22.7%	3.0%	1.5%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	68.2%	25.5%	3.8%	2.5%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	68.1%	26.7%	3.7%	1.5%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	66.7%	27.5%	4.4%	1.5%	204
Over $150,000	64.4%	31.0%	3.4%	1.1%	174
(Blank)	45.2%	16.7%	6.3%	31.7%	221
HOUSING SUPPLY	62.8%	23.5%	5.2%	8.4%	1172
Under $15,000	74.2%	19.7%	3.0%	3.0%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	61.4%	21.7%	9.6%	7.2%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	69.7%	23.5%	3.8%	3.0%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	66.2%	26.8%	3.8%	3.2%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	70.4%	24.4%	3.0%	2.2%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	69.6%	24.5%	4.9%	1.0%	204
Over $150,000	60.9%	32.2%	4.6%	2.3%	174
(Blank)	43.9%	14.9%	8.1%	33.0%	221
DISPLACEMENT OR GENTRIFICATION	62.0%	22.2%	7.8%	8.0%	1172
Under $15,000	78.8%	15.2%	3.0%	3.0%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	66.3%	12.0%	15.7%	6.0%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	78.8%	15.2%	3.0%	3.0%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	71.3%	22.3%	4.5%	1.9%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	62.2%	29.6%	5.2%	3.0%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	66.2%	24.5%	8.8%	0.5%	204

Over $150,000	50.0%	37.9%	9.8%	2.3%	174
(Blank)	44.3%	13.1%	10.4%	32.1%	221
HOUSING QUALITY	58.1%	28.2%	5.6%	8.1%	1172
Under $15,000	81.8%	12.1%	4.5%	1.5%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	60.2%	32.5%	1.2%	6.0%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	65.9%	31.1%	0.8%	2.3%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	63.1%	29.9%	4.5%	2.5%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	60.0%	28.1%	7.4%	4.4%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	52.5%	36.3%	9.8%	1.5%	204
Over $150,000	56.3%	33.9%	8.6%	1.1%	174
(Blank)	47.5%	16.3%	4.1%	32.1%	221
HOUSING STABILITY	57.7%	25.6%	8.3%	8.4%	1172
Under $15,000	74.2%	19.7%	4.5%	1.5%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	62.7%	20.5%	10.8%	6.0%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	76.5%	15.9%	4.5%	3.0%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	61.8%	28.7%	5.7%	3.8%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	59.3%	28.9%	8.1%	3.7%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	58.8%	29.4%	10.3%	1.5%	204
Over $150,000	50.0%	39.1%	9.8%	1.1%	174
(Blank)	40.7%	16.7%	9.5%	33.0%	221
SUPPORTIVE AND TRANSITIONAL HOUSING	55.5%	30.2%	6.1%	8.2%	1172
Under $15,000	71.2%	22.7%	1.5%	4.5%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	56.6%	25.3%	12.0%	6.0%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	68.9%	22.7%	3.8%	4.5%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	56.1%	36.9%	5.1%	1.9%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	58.5%	32.6%	6.7%	2.2%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	60.8%	32.4%	5.9%	1.0%	204
Over $150,000	48.3%	45.4%	5.2%	1.1%	174
(Blank)	41.2%	18.6%	7.7%	32.6%	221
HOMEOWNERSHIP	49.0%	32.7%	10.1%	8.3%	1172
Under $15,000	71.2%	22.7%	3.0%	3.0%	66
$15,000 - $29,999	51.8%	25.3%	16.9%	6.0%	83
$30,000 - $49,999	62.1%	28.0%	6.1%	3.8%	132
$50,000 - $74,999	50.3%	37.6%	9.6%	2.5%	157
$75,000 - $99,999	50.4%	40.0%	7.4%	2.2%	135
$100,000 - $150,000	51.0%	37.3%	10.3%	1.5%	204
Over $150,000	39.1%	44.8%	14.4%	1.7%	174
(Blank)	37.6%	19.5%	10.4%	32.6%	221